

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/848,869	MAUZE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Bradley L. Sisson	1634	

All Participants:
Status of Application: After Final

 (1) Bradley L. Sisson.

(3) _____.

 (2) Tim Joyce, Reg. No. 38,197.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 6 January 2004
Time: _____.

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Rejection of claims 7-20 under 35 USC 103(a)

Claims discussed:

7-20


Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet
Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Mr. Sisson expressed concern over the specification providing adequate written support for the limitation of "adding a metal ion," when at page 2 of the specification, under the "Summary of the Invention," teaches that the "probe [is] labeled with a transition metal-ligand complex for hybridizing with the target to form an initial complex..." Mr. Sisson expressed concern that while original claim 1 reflected such language, the claims have evolved over time to reflect this broader aspect, and aspect that is seemingly not adequately supported by the disclosure.

Mr. Sisson acknowledged applicant's arguments regarding to the limitations of claim 7, but noted that claim 16 is also an independent claim and is void of the limitations that applicant now argues renders the claims free of the art. .